Quantum Arthur-Merlin with single-qubit measurements

Tomoyuki Morimae[1,*]

[1] *ASRLD Unit, Gunma University, 1-5-1 Tenjin-cho Kiryu-shi Gunma-ken, 376-0052, Japan*

arXiv:1602.08656v1 [quant-ph] 28 Feb 2016

Abstract

We show that the class QAM does not change even if the verifier's ability is restricted to only single-qubit measurements. To show the result, we use the idea of the measurement-based quantum computing: the verifier, who can do only single-qubit measurements, can test the graph state sent from the prover and use it for his measurement-based quantum computing. We also introduce a new QMA-complete problem related to the stabilizer test.

*Electronic address: morimae@gunma-u.ac.jp

I. INTRODUCTION

Measurement-based quantum computing [1] is a model of quantum computing where a universal quantum computing is realized by preparing a highly-entangled quantum many-qubit state, so called a resource state, and measuring each qubit adaptively. Mathematically it is equivalent to the standard quantum circuit model, but the clear separation between the resource preparation phase (i.e., preparation of a resource state with entangling gates) and the resource consumption phase (i.e., single-qubit measurements) has enabled plenty of new results not only in quantum computing [2] but also in quantum cryptography [3–6] and condensed matter physics [7].

The measurement-based quantum computing has turned out to be useful also in quantum computational complexity. In Ref. [8], a quantum multiprover interactive proof system with a classical verifier that contains BQP was constructed. Furthermore, in Ref. [9] it was shown that the class QMA does not change even if the verifier's ability is restricted to only single-qubit measurements. The basic idea underlying these results is the graph state verification: the verifier, who is completely classical or can do only single-qubit measurements, can test the graph state generated by the prover(s) and use it for his measurement-based quantum computing.

In this paper, we generalize the result of Ref. [9] to show that the class QAM does neither change under the reduction of the verifier's ability to single-qubit measurements. Although QAM is somehow a generalized version of QMA, the proof of Ref. [9] cannot be directly used for the QAM case, since the prover's strategy, i.e., generating the correct graph state or trying to cheat the verifier, can depend on the previous message by the verifier. Furthermore, the local Hamiltonian technique used in Ref. [9] can neither be used since there is no known local Hamiltonian problem hard for QAM. We nevertheless show that the reduction of the verifier's ability is possible by using the graph state test.

The class QAM was introduced by Marriott and Watrous [10]:

Definition: For an instance $x \in \{0,1\}^*$, we consider the following protocol, which we call a QAM system:

1. Arthur (the verifier) sends Merlin (the prover) a random $s(|x|)$-bit string $y \in \{0,1\}^{s(|x|)}$, where s is a polynomial.

2. Merlin sends Arthur an $m(|x|)$-qubit state $|\psi_{x,y}\rangle$, which can depend on x and y, where m is a polynomial.

3. Arthur applies a (uniformly generated) unitary $A_{x,y}$, which can depend on x and y, on $|\psi_{x,y}\rangle \otimes |+\rangle^{\otimes v(|x|)}$, where $|+\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ and v is a polynomial. (In the original definition, ancilla qubits are initialized in $|0\rangle$. In this paper, however, we initialize in $|+\rangle$, since it is more convenient for the measurement-based quantum computing.) Arthur measures the output qubit. If the result is 1 (0), he accepts (rejects).

The acceptance probability p_{acc} of the QAM system is defined by

$$p_{acc} \equiv \frac{1}{2^s} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^s} \left\| \Pi_1 A_{x,y} |\psi_{x,y}\rangle \otimes |+\rangle^{\otimes v} \right\|^2,$$

where $\Pi_1 \equiv |1\rangle\langle 1|$ is the projection on the output qubit. A language L is in QAM(a,b) if and only if there exists a QAM system such that

- If $x \in L$, then there exists a set $\{|\psi_{x,y}\rangle\}_y$ of $m(|x|)$-qubit states such that $p_{acc} \geq a$.
- If $x \notin L$, then for any set $\{|\psi_{x,y}\rangle\}_y$ of $m(|x|)$-qubit states, $p_{acc} \leq b$.

As is shown in Ref. [10], the error bound (a, b) can be arbitrary: as long as $a - b \geq \frac{1}{poly(|x|)}$, $\mathrm{QAM}(a, b) \subseteq \mathrm{QAM}(1 - 2^{-r}, 2^{-r})$ for any polynomial r.

The main result of the present paper is

$$\mathrm{QAM} = \mathrm{QAM}_{\mathrm{single}},$$

where $\mathrm{QAM}_{\mathrm{single}}$ is equivalent to QAM except that the verifier can do only single-qubit measurements.

In the discussion section, we also introduce a new QMA-complete problem that is related to the stabilizer test.

II. STABILIZER TEST

In this section, we explain the stabilizer test, which will be used in this paper. (The following stabilizer test is a generalized version of that in Ref. [9]: in Ref. [9] only the graph state stabilizers are considered, whereas in the following the test is generalized to any stabilizers.)

The N-fold Pauli group is the set of N-fold tensor products of Pauli operators:

$$\Big\{\{1,-1,i,-i\}\bigotimes_{j=1}^{N}\{I_j,X_j,Y_j,Z_j\}\Big\}.$$

A stabilizer is an abelian subgroup of the N-fold Pauli group not containing $-I^{\otimes N}$.

Let us consider an N-qubit state ρ and a set $g\equiv\{g_1,...,g_n\}$ of generators of a stabilizer. The stabilizer test is the following test:

1. Randomly generate an n-bit string $k\equiv(k_1,...,k_n)\in\{0,1\}^n$.

2. Measure the operator

$$s_k\equiv\prod_{j=1}^{n}g_j^{k_j}.$$

   Note that this measurement can be done with single-qubit measurements, since s_k is a tensor product of Pauli operators:

$$\Big\{\{1,-1\}\bigotimes_{j=1}^{N}\{I_j,X_j,Y_j,Z_j\}\Big\}.$$

   (Note that the phase of s_k cannot be $\pm i$, since if so $s_k^2=-I^{\otimes N}$, which contradicts to the definition of the stabilizer.)

3. If the result is $+1$ (-1), the test passes (fails).

The probability of passing the stabilizer test is

$$p_{pass}=\frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{k\in\{0,1\}^n}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\frac{I^{\otimes N}+s_k}{2}\rho\Big).$$

We can show that if the probability of passing the test is high, which means $p_{pass}\geq 1-\epsilon$ for an $\epsilon>0$, then ρ is "close" to a certain stabilized state σ in the sense of

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M\sigma)(1-2\epsilon)-2\sqrt{2\epsilon}\leq\mathrm{Tr}(M\rho)\leq\mathrm{Tr}(M\sigma)+2\sqrt{2\epsilon}$$

for any POVM element M.

In fact, if $p_{pass}\geq 1-\epsilon$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{n}\frac{I^{\otimes N}+g_j}{2}\rho\Big)\geq 1-2\epsilon.$$

Let

$$\Lambda \equiv \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{I^{\otimes N} + g_j}{2}.$$

Note that $\Lambda^\dagger = \Lambda$ and $\Lambda^2 = \Lambda$, and therefore $0 \leq \Lambda \leq I^{\otimes N}$. From the gentle measurement lemma [11, 12],

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho - \Lambda\rho\Lambda\|_1 &\leq 2\sqrt{1 - \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{1 - (1 - 2\epsilon)} \\ &= 2\sqrt{2\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Note that

$$g_j \frac{\Lambda\rho\Lambda}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)} g_j = \frac{\Lambda\rho\Lambda}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)}$$

for any j, and therefore,

$$\sigma \equiv \frac{\Lambda\rho\Lambda}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)}$$

is a stabilized state.

From Eq. (1), we obtain for any POVM element M

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M\rho) - \mathrm{Tr}(M\Lambda\rho\Lambda) \leq 2\sqrt{2\epsilon},$$

which means

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}(M\rho) &\leq \mathrm{Tr}\Big(M \frac{\Lambda\rho\Lambda}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)}\Big)\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho) + 2\sqrt{2\epsilon} \\ &\leq \mathrm{Tr}\Big(M \frac{\Lambda\rho\Lambda}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)}\Big) + 2\sqrt{2\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

And, for any positive operator M,

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M\Lambda\rho\Lambda) - \mathrm{Tr}(M\rho) \leq 2\sqrt{2\epsilon},$$

which means

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}(M\rho) &\geq \mathrm{Tr}\Big(M \frac{\Lambda\rho\Lambda}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)}\Big)\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho) - 2\sqrt{2\epsilon} \\ &\geq \mathrm{Tr}\Big(M \frac{\Lambda\rho\Lambda}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)}\Big)(1 - 2\epsilon) - 2\sqrt{2\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

III. PROOF OF THE RESULT

Now let us show our main result, $\mathrm{QAM}_{\mathrm{single}} = \mathrm{QAM}$. The inclusion $\mathrm{QAM} \supseteq \mathrm{QAM}_{\mathrm{single}}$ is obvious. We show the inverse $\mathrm{QAM} \subseteq \mathrm{QAM}_{\mathrm{single}}$. Let us assume that a language L is in QAM. From the corresponding QAM system, we construct the following $\mathrm{QAM}_{\mathrm{single}}$ system:

1. Arthur sends Merlin a random $s(|x|)$-bit string $y \in \{0,1\}^{s(|x|)}$.

2. Honest Merlin generates the state

$$\Big(\bigotimes_{e \in E_{connect}} CZ_e \Big) \big(|\psi_{x,y}\rangle \otimes |G\rangle \big), \tag{2}$$

   where $|\psi_{x,y}\rangle$ is the m-qubit state (the original witness) on the subsystem V_2, $|G\rangle$ is the N-qubit graph state on the subsystem V_1, and $E_{connect}$ is the set of edges that connect V_1 and V_2 (see Fig. 1), where $N = poly(|x|)$. Malicious Merlin generates any $(m+N)$-qubit state $\rho_{x,y}$. Merlin sends qubits of his $(m+N)$-qubit state one by one to Arthur.

3. With probability q, which is specified later, Arthur does the measurement-based quantum computing on qubits sent from Merlin. If the computation accepts (rejects), Arthur accepts (rejects). With probability $1-q$, Arthur does the following stabilizer test: Arthur generates a random N-bit string $k \equiv (k_1, ..., k_N) \in \{0,1\}^N$, and measures the operator

$$s_k \equiv \prod_{j \in V_1} g_j^{k_j},$$

   where

$$g_j \equiv X_j \bigotimes_{i \in S_j} Z_i$$

   is the graph state stabilizer on jth qubit. Here, S_j is the set of the nearest-neighbour qubits of jth qubit. If the measurement result is $+1$ (-1), Arthur accepts (rejects).

If $x \in L$, Merlin is honest, and therefore he generates the state of Eq. (2). In this case, Arthur can do the correct computation, i.e., $A_{x,y}$, if he chooses computation, and passes



FIG. 1: The system that Merlin sends to Arthur.

the stabilizer test with probability 1 if he chooses the test. Therefore, the total acceptance probability $p_{acc}^{x\in L}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} p_{acc}^{x\in L} &= \frac{1}{2^s}\sum_{y\in\{0,1\}^s}\Big[q\big\|\Pi_1 A_{x,y}|\psi_{x,y}\rangle\otimes|+\rangle^{\otimes v}\big\|^2+(1-q)\times 1\Big] \\ &\geq qa+(1-q)\equiv\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

If $x\notin L$, Merlin is malicious, and he can send any state. Let $Y_1\subseteq\{0,1\}^s$ be the set of y such that $\rho_{x,y}$ passes the stabilizer test with probability $\geq 1-\epsilon$, where $\epsilon=\frac{1}{128|x|^2}$. We also define $Y_2\equiv\{0,1\}^s-Y_1$. Note that $|Y_1|+|Y_2|=2^s$. Let p_{MBQC}^y be the acceptance probability when Arthur does the measurement-based quantum computing on $\rho_{x,y}$, and let p_{test}^y be the acceptance probability when Arthur does the stabilizer test on $\rho_{x,y}$. Then, the total acceptance probability $p_{acc}^{x\notin L}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} p_{acc}^{x\notin L} &= \frac{1}{2^s}\sum_{y\in\{0,1\}^s}\Big[qp_{MBQC}^y+(1-q)p_{test}^y\Big] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^s}\sum_{y\in Y_1}\Big[qp_{MBQC}^y+(1-q)p_{test}^y\Big]+\frac{1}{2^s}\sum_{y\in Y_2}\Big[qp_{MBQC}^y+(1-q)p_{test}^y\Big] \\ &< \frac{1}{2^s}\sum_{y\in Y_1}\Big[q\big(\|\Pi_1 A_{x,y}|\psi_{x,y}\rangle\otimes|+\rangle^{\otimes v}\|^2+\delta\big)+(1-q)\Big]+\frac{1}{2^s}\sum_{y\in Y_2}\Big[q+(1-q)(1-\epsilon)\Big] \\ &\leq qb+\frac{(q\delta+1-q)|Y_1|}{2^s}+\frac{(q+(1-q)(1-\epsilon))|Y_2|}{2^s} \\ &= qb+\frac{(q\delta+1-q)|Y_1|}{2^s}+\frac{(q\delta+1-q)|Y_2|}{2^s}-\frac{(q\delta+1-q)|Y_2|}{2^s}+\frac{(q+(1-q)(1-\epsilon))|Y_2|}{2^s} \\ &= qb+q\delta+1-q+\frac{(q-q\delta+q\epsilon-\epsilon)|Y_2|}{2^s}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta = 2\sqrt{2\epsilon}$. If we take

$$q = \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon-\delta},$$

we obtain

$$q - q\delta + q\epsilon - \epsilon = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{acc}^{x\notin L} &\leq qb + q\delta + 1 - q \\ &\equiv \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Then, if $a = \frac{2}{3}$ and $b = \frac{1}{3}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha - \beta &\geq q(a - b - \delta) \\ &= \frac{(a-b-\delta)\epsilon}{1+\epsilon-\delta} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{12 \times 129|x|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, L is in $\mathrm{QAM}_{single}(\alpha, \beta)$ with $\alpha - \beta \geq \frac{1}{poly(|x|)}$.

IV. DISCUSSION: A QMA-COMPLETE PROBLEM

In this paper, we have shown that by using the stabilizer test, the verifier's ability of QAM can be reduced to the single-qubit measurements.

In this section, we point out that the stabilizer test also gives a new QMA complete problem:

- Input: the set $g \equiv (g_1, ..., g_k)$ of generators of an n-qubit stabilizer, an n-qubit POVM element M, and $0 \leq b < a \leq 1$ such that $a - b \geq 1/poly(n)$.
- Task: decide whether $h_{Stab(g)}(M)$ is $\geq a$ or $\leq b$.

Here,

$$h_{Stab(g)}(M) \equiv \max_{\rho}\{\mathrm{Tr}(M\rho) : \rho \in Stab(g)\},$$

and $Stab(g)$ be the set of n-qubit states that are stabilized by g, i.e., states such that $g_i|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$ for all $i = 1, ..., k$.

Note that if we replace $Stab(g)$ in the above definition with $Sep(d, d)$, which is the set of separable states, it is known that to calculate it up to $1/\mathrm{poly}(d)$ accuracy is NP-hard [13], and to estimate it to a constant additive error is QMA(2)-complete [14].

We first show the above problem is QMA-hard. Let A be a problem in QMA, and $|\psi\rangle$ be a witness of a yes instance. We take $g = \{g_j\}_{j\in V_1}$ as the graph state stabilizers, and M be the POVM element corresponding to the acceptance of the measurement-based quantum computing that simulates the verification circuit. Then, if $x \in A_{yes}$,

$$h_{Stab(g)}(M) \geq \mathrm{Tr}(MG_\psi) \geq a,$$

and if $x \in A_{no}$,

$$h_{Stab(g)}(M) = \max_{\xi}\{\mathrm{Tr}(MG_\xi)\} \leq b.$$

Here, G_ψ and G_ξ are states constructed by connecting ψ and ξ to the graph state by CZ gates as Eq. (2).

We next show the problem is in QMA. In the yes case, the prover sends ρ that maximizes $h_{Stab(g)}(M)$ to the verifier. With probability q, which is specified later, the verifier does a POVM measurement that contains M. If M is realized, he accepts. With probability $1-q$, the verifier does the stabilizer test, and if passes, he accepts. The acceptance probability is

$$\begin{aligned} p_{acc} &= q\mathrm{Tr}(M\rho) + (1-q) \\ &\geq qa + (1-q) \equiv \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

In the no case, the prover sends any state ρ. Let p_{pass} be the probability of passing the stabilizer test, and let us define $\epsilon = \frac{(a-b)^2}{32}$. If $p_{pass} < 1-\epsilon$, The acceptance probability is

$$\begin{aligned} p_{acc} &= q\mathrm{Tr}(M\rho) + (1-q)p_{pass} \\ &\leq q + (1-q)(1-\epsilon) \equiv \beta_1. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $p_{pass} \geq 1-\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}(M\rho) &\leq \mathrm{Tr}\Big[M\frac{\Lambda\rho\Lambda}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\rho)}\Big] + \delta \\ &\leq b + \delta, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} p_{acc} &= q\mathrm{Tr}(M\rho) + (1-q)p_{pass} \\ &\leq q(b+\delta) + (1-q) \equiv \beta_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta = 2\sqrt{2\epsilon}$. Let us define

$$\Delta_1 \equiv \alpha - \beta_1,$$
$$\Delta_2 \equiv \alpha - \beta_2.$$

Let us take q as the value

$$q^* \equiv \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon-b-\delta},$$

which satisfies $\Delta_1(q^*) = \Delta_2(q^*)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2(q^*) &= \frac{\epsilon(a-b-\delta)}{1+\epsilon-b-\delta} \\ &\geq \frac{(a-b)^3}{32\times 4} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{poly(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the problem is in QMA.

Acknowledgments

TM is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas No.15H00850 of MEXT Japan, and the Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) No.26730003 of JSPS.

---

[1] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, A one-way quantum computer. Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).

[2] R. Raussendorf, J. Harrington, and K. Goyal, Topological fault-tolerance in cluster state quantum computation. New J. Phys. **9**, 199 (2007).

[3] A. Broadbent, J. F. Fitzsimons, and E. Kashefi, Universal blind quantum computation. 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (2009).

[4] J. F. Fitzsimons and E. Kashefi, Unconditionally verifiable blind computation. arXiv:1203.5217

[5] T. Morimae and K. Fujii, Blind quantum computation protocol in which Alice only makes measurements. Phys. Rev. A **87**, 050301(R) (2013).

[6] M. Hayashi and T. Morimae, Verifiable measurement-only blind quantum computing with stabilizer testing. Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 220502 (2015).

[7] G. Brennen and A. Miyake, Measurement-based quantum computer in the gapped ground state of a two-body Hamiltonian. Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 010502 (2008).

[8] M. McKague, Interactive proofs for BQP via self-tested graph states. arXiv:1309.5675

[9] T. Morimae, D. Nagaj, and N. Schuch, Quantum proofs can be verified using only single qubit measurements. Phys. Rev. A **93**, 022326 (2016).

[10] C. Marriott and J. Watrous, Quantum Arthur-Merlin games. Computational Complexity **14**, 122-152 (2005).

[11] A. Winter, Coding Theorem and Strong Converse for Quantum Channels. IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 45, no. 7, pp.2481-2485 (1999).

[12] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, Making good codes for classical-quantum channel coding via quantum hypothesis testing. IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol.53, no. 6, pp.2261-2266 (2007).

[13] L. Gurvits, Classical deterministic complexity of Edmonds' problem and quantum entanglement. In Proc. 35th Annual ACM Symp. Theory of computing, pp.10-19 (2003).

[14] A. W. Harrow and A. Montanaro, Testing product states, quantum Merlin-Arthur games and tensor optimisation. arXiv:1001.0017